The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. X. ST. LOUIS, MO., OCTOBER 15, 1903. NO. 39.

CATHOLICS AND THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS.

On October 9th, 1902, there took place in Dresden, the capital of Saxony, a remarkable debate on the foundation of a so-called "Reform Gymnasium." The mayor of the city warmly advocated the establishment of such a school, chiefly from the national standpoint. He declared that the humanistic gymnasium could not give that national education which was demanded at the present time in Germany. "Remember," he said, "that the great majority of the representatives of our *Reichstag* belong to a party which has its centre not in national interests and feelings, but beyond the Alps.....And the leading men of this party have been educated in the humanistic gymnasium. They are to-day the men that domineer in our parliament!" Enthusiastic applause followed this outburst of "patriotic and national feeling," and this applause was repeated whenever the speaker alluded to the terrible dangers that threatened Germany from "Romish influence," which is so insidiously exerted on the German youth through the classical studies.

If it be remembered that the Protestants in Saxony exhibit a bigotry which is almost incredible, it will be understood how the audience was horrified at discovering that Popish wiles had been practised on their children for so many centuries. At last it was discovered where the Centre, that dangerous "anti-national party," imbibed its pernicious principles: in the study of the classics, by means of which the Pope wields a disastrous influence in the politics of the fatherland! Even the *Neue Jahrbücher*, of Leipzig (1902, vol. 10, p. 568), a publication which is often unfriendly to Catholics, could not help ridiculing this absurd outburst of narrowness and bigotry, and asked in surprise, by

whom and how this pernicious influence of Rome was exercised upon the youth in the German gymnasia.

I was reminded of this incident when I read the article "Must Greek Go?" (THE REVIEW, September 24th). There the following statement of a Catholic paper is quoted: "Yale will no longer require Greek for matriculation. When will our Catholic colleges give up that dead corpse of a language? If the Jesuits in this country were not dominated by the leaders of the society in Europe, they would probably drop Greek and otherwise make their curriculum up to date according to American ideas. But sooner or later Greek must go." This reminded me of the Dresden speech, because both the Protestant mayor and the Catholic paper see an anti-national influence exercised from "headquarters beyond the Alps." THE REVIEW refutes part of this startling utterance of the Catholic paper by a lengthy quotation from my recent work on 'Jesuit Education' (p. 331), where it is said that the Society of Jesus upholds the classical curriculum, not because this is the old traditional system, but because it has so far proved the best means of training the mind, and that, if other means should prove better than the classical languages, the Jesuits would not hesitate to accept them; and they could do this without being obliged to change their system. In confirmation of this statement I may quote the words of the present General of the Society, who, in 1893, declared that it was a very erroneous view of the Jesuit system of studies to consider the subject matter as the essence, whereas it is the spirit which forms the essential and characteristic feature of the Ratio Studiorum. What this spirit consists in I need not explain here, as anyone desirous of knowing it may find it explained in my volume on 'Jesuit Education.' So much is certain that the Jesuits in this country do not uphold Greek as an integral part of the college course, because "they are dominated by the leaders of the society in Europe." And we can confidently assure the reader that, if the American Jesuits thought it necessary or advisable to drop Greek, there would not be any opposition on the part of the leaders of the Society in Europe, however much they might regret the abandonment of the Greek language. For the very constitutions of the Society and its Ratio Studiorum declare explicitly in many passages that, "according to the difference of country, time, and circumstances, different regulations may be necessary."

This may suffice as regards the attitude of the Society towards these studies. We do not intend to enter on a controversy with anyone on this subject, but seize this occasion to make some observations which it might be well for Catholics in this country not to lose sight of.

It is said that Greek should be dropped and the curriculum otherwise be made up to date according to American ideas. This is not the first time that such demands have been made. They resemble very much the charges of President Eliot against the Jesuit schools for not accepting his electivism. Is this electivism among the changes that are "otherwise" needed? Perhaps so; but one thing is sure: from the reason alleged it would follow that, according to the supposed "American ideas," not only Greek but also Latin must go. For Latin as well as Greek is a dead language, and on that very account many modern educators have no more use for Latin than Greek in their schemes of education. The history of educational movements of the last decades has proved that those who wished Greek to be eliminated from the curriculum, soon after turned against Latin as well, and advanced similar reasons against the retention of this language. It is true, during the Middle Ages Latin was studied in Western Christendom without Greek; but anyone who knows the educational history of that period must admit that medieval education, although it possessed some excellent characteristics, was on many other points defective. One defect was the utter absence of the literary, æsthetic, and historical study of the classics. Now-a-days it is demanded that much more attention be paid to this side of the study of the classics than was done formerly; and rightly so. But such a study of Latin is impossible without studying Greek. Latin literature, however excellent it may be, is essentially an imitation of Greek literature. But a thorough understanding and correct appreciation of an imitation can not be obtained unless the original model be studied. Thus no one can fully appreciate Vergil's grand Aeneid without an acquaintance with Homer; nor can Cicero's philosophical and oratorical works be rightly estimated without a fair knowledge of his sources, that is above all, Plato's works. Thus without knowledge of Greek the study of Latin is deprived of its best aid, and must fail to produce all the good results which, according to modern views of the object and scope of classical studies, are to be expected from the study of Latin.

Add to this the following weighty considerations: Greek literature is in many regards superior to Latin literature. This explains why a great many modern educators wish Greek to be emphasized much more than Latin. Although we need not accept this conclusion, it shows that the same objections which are raised against Greek can be urged with equal force against Latin. A Catholic might say that Latin, as the language of the Church, should be maintained on that account in Catholic schools. But would thereby abandon the position held by thousands

of educators in every country, not only Catholics but also Protestants, that the study of Latin has in itself a great educational value. Catholics who would recommend the study of Latin on the ground of its being the language of the Church, would narrow the scope of this study, would practically declare it to be only of value for merely extrinsic reasons. The natural consequence would be that Latin should be studied by those who need it, that is the Catholic clergy and perhaps a few others. Thus Latin, too, would become a professional study and would be abandoned as a means of general training.

But now we come to a more important point. It has been said, at least implicitly, that American educational ideas demand the abandonment of Greek in the college curriculum. Is this true? It can not be denied that a very strong, active, and influential party among American educators are opposed to its retention and have succeeded in having it dropped as a necessary requirement for entrance into college. But the same has been done in several countries in Europe. Greek has lost its influential position in Germany, and last year it was nearly excluded as a necessary requirement for admission at Oxford, England. Hence it is entirely misleading to represent the exclusion of Greek as a peculiarly American idea. Besides, is it correct to call it an American idea without any limitation? As we have remarked, there is a very strong party opposed to it, but there are also very many distinguished American educators who deeply regret the anti-Greek and anti-classical movement, because they regard the neglect of these studies as most detrimental to solid training and liberal education. I have quoted statements of many prominent men who strongly denounce this modern tendency, and among them are men distinguished in every pursuit of active life.*) I do not wish to repeat these statements here, but if the reader desires others, I would refer him to a recent valuable pamphlet of Father Murphy, of Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass. The pamphlet is entitled: "Popular Errors about Classical Studies." The careful perusal of it might convince some Catholics that they are not altogether free from popular errors on this subject. There the reader will find some excellent remarks on the advantages of the classical studies, by Mayor Low of New York, Senator Hoar, Dean Briggs of Harvard, Professor Münsterberg of Harvard, who, though a professor of a most modern science, experimental psychology, thinks that the study of Greek is most beneficial for all and is convinced that it has done him a great deal of good. James Russell Lowell said at Harvard: "If the classical

*) 'Jesuit Education,' chapters 10 and 12.

languages are dead, they yet speak to us, and with a clearer voice than any living tongue. If the Greek language is dead, yet the literature it enshrines is crammed with life as perhaps no other writing, except Shakespeare's, ever was or will be." And Chancellor Andrews of Nebraska maintains that we could not afford to allow Greek to die, if there were any danger of its doing so, because it is a social necessity. "No modern community," he said in the meeting of the National Education Association, 1902, "can as a community, dispense with Greek, unless it elects to be barbaric." Well, then, this Greek is a pretty lively "dead corpse" after all! Many more similar statements of eminent American educators could be quoted, but they may be seen in the works referred to.

Two points, however, must be touched. The first is the steady increase of the study of Greek in this country. The last reports of the Commissioner of Education show that the study of Greek is not at all waning. It is true that the percentage of students taking Greek at high-schools is a little less now than it was ten years ago, but during the last decade the number of students taking Greek in college has almost doubled, and in percentage of increase it ranks among the first branches.

Another fact to which we must advert, is the case of Yale, because the recent change at this University has given rise to much comment in the newspapers. At the commencement of Yale in 1902, President Hadley declared that a careful enquiry among the masters of the secondary schools had furnished abundant evidence decidedly unfavorable to the abandonment of Greek as a requirement for entrance into college, and he allowed it to be understood that Greek would be required at Yale for a good while to come (*Yale Alumni Weekly*, July 31st, 1902). However, the change came sooner than one might have expected. It occurred just a year after the above declaration. Still,—and this fact should not have been hushed in silence by those who argue from the attitude of Yale—it is evident that this change was practically forced on Yale by the attitude of other leading universities. Many question even now the wisdom of this change, and deplore the fact that it was considered "inevitable." What is more remarkable, at the very moment when the change was announced, the following clause was added: "It is indeed expected that the great majority of the candidates for the degree (of Bachelor of Arts) will have studied Greek in preparation for college, and that it will be extensively pursued in the college course itself; but for those who feel unable or unwilling to pursue it, the substitution of other courses of equal difficulty is allowed." (*Yale Alumni Weekly*, July 15th, 1903). From this it is quite evident that the

faculty of Yale by no means considers Greek a "dead corpse." It is also clear that it can not be said that "American ideas" demand the abandonment of the study of Greek. Not long ago one of the very best and ablest American papers, the New York *Evening Post*, expressed the conviction that, "if a few of our American colleges would stand firm upon the traditional course in Greek, Latin, mathematics, and philosophy, teaching each student the elements of one natural science and of two at least of the modern languages," the experiment would be fully justified by its practical results. Why should not the Catholic colleges "make this experiment," that is, stand firm upon the course which they pursue at present, trying to teach it well? For the curriculum of Catholic colleges, on the whole, is that recommended by the *Post:* Latin, Greek, English, and either French, or German, (in some places Spanish), natural sciences in the highest classes together with philosophy—we should add history. This is exactly the course followed in the Jesuit colleges of this country.

Why should Catholic colleges abandon this course? The answer is: "Because you must adapt your colleges to American ideas." This means practically: You must follow the leading non-Catholic colleges and universities, as Harvard, Columbia, etc. But why must Catholic colleges go begging to these institutions for their educational ideas and ideals? Is it because these universities possess the monopoly of educational wisdom or of truly national and patriotic spirit?

As regards the first point, we have seen that many eminent American educationists question the wisdom of those changes which above all claim at present to represent American ideas. We have heard what some of these educators say on the dropping of Greek. Another such idea is electivism, which has been so vigorously advocated as the only possible system for America at the present day and for all future ages. And yet, this very system has not only been condemned but ridiculed by leading American educators. I refer the reader to 'Jesuit Education,' especially chapter 11: "Prescribed Courses or Elective Studies?"

Why then should the Catholic colleges be blamed if they are not willing to accept these ideas? Or are they blindly to take up every new theory that is put forth by some modern educationist, because the number of those who advocate it happens to be large and their influence in pedagogical circles, great?

If it be said that the cause of Greek, and the classics in general, is only weakly and timidly defended at present, we can deny it. But granted that it be so, is the weakly defended always the wrong cause, and the strongly defended the right? If this were true, what would we have to think of Christianity in the first cen-

turies? What of the Catholic Church in this country until a few decades ago? Well has President McCosh of Princeton said: "Of all acts of cowardice the meanest is that which leads us to abandon a good cause because it is weak, and to join a bad cause because it is strong." Of course, I might be told that I am begging the question if I assume the cause of Latin and Greek to be the good one; I do not assume it here, but merely wish to state that, even if the cause of the classics were weakly defended, and if all non-Catholic colleges had practically abondoned them, this fact alone would not prove that the cause is the wrong one.

"Be this as it may, since the subject matter of education is indifferent from the religious point of view, Catholic colleges should conform to the national ideas in this regard." How shall we answer this objection? We shall have to distinguish. About a year ago a learned and zealous bishop issued a splendid pastoral on "Reform, True and False." A similar distinction must be made as regards ideas which underlie reforms or attempts at reform. There are national ideas which are good, and there are others of questionable worth. The one class exhibits the good qualities of a nation, the other its shortcomings. Lest it be imagined that the writer is opposed to adaptations in education according to national ideas—provided they are good—it may be well to repeat here what he has said on another occasion: "We do not deny that our age demands something new in education. Growth and development are necessary in educational systems. Every age and every nation has its own spirit, its peculiar ways and means to meet a given end, and these very ways and means inevitably call for modifications and adaptations in educational systems." ('Jesuit Education,' p. 4). But in adapting educational methods to national ideas, care must be taken not to adapt education to those national ideas which themselves stand in need of correction, otherwise "school reform" will prove nothing but "school deterioration," as Professor Münsterberg of Harvard puts it. Now, as regards education, there exist in this country some excellent ideas. Americans heartily believe in the value of education; they think no sacrifice too great for the improvement of school buildings, of methods of teaching and training the teachers, etc. These are truly noble ideas. But there is another class of ideas which by far-seeing Americans of all denominations are stigmatized as the besetting sins in our educational system. Everything is to be made easy; studies are to serve immediately some practical purpose; interest is stimulated without corresponding stress being laid on thorough discipline; a superficial knowledge of many disconnected branches is preferred to a thorough mastery of a few well-connected subjects;

specialization is attempted before a solid foundation of general culture is laid; the spirit of commercialism is exalted above more ideal pursuits; short cuts are preferred to persistent efforts which lead slowly to the desired goal. Wherever these ideas are advocated in disguise—they never appear openly, but assume some specious name—they should not be adapted but vigorously combated. A careful observer will soon find that this set of ideas turns especially against the classical studies, which are branded with such opprobrious names as "useless, antiquated studies," or "dead corpses." ROBERT SCHWICKERATH, S. J.

[*To be concluded.*]

* * *

THE POLISH PETITION TO THE HOLY SEE.

II.

Ex hisce litteris patet, nos Polonos in Rebuspublicis foederatis Americae Septentrionalis domicilium habentes, in hac re de obtinendis Polonis Episcopis et sapienter et in "vero spiritu Catholico" procedere. Patet etiam, rem de qua nobis agitur, esse magni momenti, adeo ut ipsi Archiepiscopi Americani fateantur, non esse "in eorum potestate" eandem exequi, dicantque, rem illam pertinere unice ad unamquamque Dioecesim vel Provinciam quarum interest. Sed quoniam haec ultima verba sane non ita intelligenda sunt, quasi res nostra ad singulos Episcopos Americanos unice pertineat, nullatenus etiam ad Sedem istam Romanam, ideo nos jure meritoque putamus, hanc quoque nostram expostulationem ad Te, Beatissime Pater, esse faciendam in eodem "vero spiritu Catholico" et sapientia quam in nos Episcopatus Americanus supra laudavit. Ad quem enim ibimus in re tam gravis momenti, ut superet auctoritatem Archiepiscopatus Americani? in re, a qua tamen pendet salus aeterna populi Poloni in America?

Quae contra dicuntur ab Americanizatoribus, uti aiunt, refutantur.

Nonnulli quidem Catholici in America, confundentes notionem unitatis cum notione uniformitatis, timebant, ne, si Poloni proprios haberent pastores-episcopos, fidei inde unitas in America periclitaretur. Sed hi, ex falsa praemissa, falsam etiam conclusionem deducebant. Opinio ista, quasi ad servandam in America fidei unitatem, necessaria esset etiam in lingua (nempe anglica) uniformitas, prorsus erronea est, et, ut usus docet, ipsi fidei unitati quam maxime perniciosa. Usu enim auctore, Poloni, qui "anglizantur, non penitus evangelizantur," siquidem una cum lingua, patrum suorum fidem quoque, quod quam maxime do-

lemus, amittere consueverunt. Certe, uniformitas in lingua, non solum in America, sed toto orbe terrarum valde optanda et desideranda esset; verum "ut terra sit labii unius," (Gen. 11, 1.) haec sunt pia desideria, quae numquam adimplebuntur. Attamen si magnum bonum est uniformitas in lingua, omnino majus est bonum unitas in fide. Quid ergo? Numquid iactura facienda est unitatis fidei ut in Rebuspublicis Foederatis uniformitas linguae, nempe anglicae, obtineatur? annon potius, contra, uniformitatis linguae iactura facienda est, ut fidei unitas servetur? Nemo non videt hanc ultimam optionem praeferendam esse, eo vel magis, quod unitas ipsa fidei plus corroboretur varietate linguarum, quam uniformitate. Non solum Poloni, sed et Germani et Galli et aliae gentes in Rebuspublicis foederatis, omnes cum hac conveniunt sententia: quod juventus, amissa patria lingue, patrum quoque fidem amittit. Hinc vere dixit Ill. Epus Spalding (in Spring Valley, Ill. a. 1892): "Varietas nationum in unitate fidei, in hoc consistit robur et pulchritudo Ecclesiae Catholicae in America."

Reipublicae unitati non obstat usus diversarum linguarum, numquid Ecclesiae unitati obstabit?

Respublicae Foederatae Americae Septentrionalis non constituunt unam uniformem nationem, uti v. g. est Hispania vel Gallia, sed sunt potius civitates *polygloticae*, mixtura quaedam variarum nationum in unum corpus civile, cujus quamquam publica lingua est anglica, nihilominus cives inter se diversissimis loquuntur sermonibus. Rectores ipsi civitatum foederatarum neminem cogunt ad discendam linguam anglicam, ne prohibent quidem, quominus quis utatur lingua qualibet; quin etiam magistratus nonnullarum urbium, ut Milwaukee in Republica Wisconsin, in publicis litteris, quae mandari solent ephemeridibus, non solum anglica, sed aliis quoque utuntur linguis, ut germanica pro Germanis, polona pro Polonis. Quam ob rem, si Reipublicae unitati non obstat publicus usus diversarum linguarum, num Ecclesiae unitati obstabit? Num uniformitas linguae, nempe anglicae, necessaria erit conditio ad tuendam et servandam fidei unitatem? Num haec lingua anglica sola est, qua continetur verbum Dei?

Utinam una sit publica lingua Ecclesiae, et haec sit latina etiam in America!

Si quaedam in publicis Ecclesiae causis uniformitas desideranda est, ad hanc uniformitatem assequendam profecto una publica lingua satis est quae quidem sit lingua latina. Ab americanizatoribus tamen lingua anglica, non latina, usu et consuetudine, habetur tamquam lingua publica Ecclesiae.

Praeter latinam linguam publicam Ecclesiae, ceterae linguae jure fruantur aequali in Ecclesia Americana!

Magnus sane et periculosus error Americanizatorum, qui putant, introducta apud se una lingua anglica, se eo ipso corroborasse unitatem fidei. Lingua est, ut aiunt, anima nationis. Lingua vernacula est, natura, pretiosissimus populi thesaurus, et qui hunc thesaurum rapere quomodocunque machinatur, furem et raptorem se facit. Quocirca monet St. Paulus: "Et loqui linguis nolite prohibere" (I, Cor. 14, 39), et St. Ignatius Loyola sapienter monet socios suos, ut praedicent lingua cujusvis nationis propria. Etiam hodie missionarii Catholici in nulla natione, in nulla gente, vel maxime barbara, suam introducunt linguam, sed potius ipsi discunt linguam istius gentis, cui praedicant propriam. Idcirco etiam Apostolus gentium dicit ad 1. Cor, 14, 18: "Gratias ago Deo meo, quod *omnium vestrum* lingua loquor." Non una lingua latina loquitur St. Paulus, quae suo tempore non minus erat diffusa, quam anglica hodie, sed dicit "omnium vestrum lingua loquor." Neque dicit ad Corinthios: "Vos, quotquot estis sub imperio Romano, debetis omnes latine loqui," sed dicit: "Gratias ago Deo meo, quod *omnium vestrum* lingua loquor."

Non ergo S. Paulus unitatem linguae necessariam putavit ad unitatem fidei servandam; immo S. Paulus se ut "barbarum" considerasset, si ad audientis populi linguam se non accomodasset; dicit enim: "Tam multa, ut puta, genera linguarum sunt in hoc mundo, et nihil sine voce est. Si ergo nesciero virtutem vocis, *ero ei, cui loquor, barbarus: et qui loquitur, mihi barbarus*" (I. Cor. 14, 10, 11).

Episcopi Americani ipsi confitentur, se propter ignorantiam linguarum et dolere et invictas experiri difficultates.

Hoc idem quod S. Paulus sensit, sentiunt et Episcopi Americani, nempe se esse "barbaros" quotiescumque Polonos alloquuntur lingua anglica. Quotiescumque enim verba faciunt ad Polonos, sermonem suum vulgo hoc "*stereotypico*" incipiunt exordio: "Doleo valde, quod non possum vos alloqui vestra propria lingua." Hinc etiam sequitur, ut nostris Revmis Episcopis in America, qui unam tantum linguam anglicam callent (tales autem, plerumque, habemus), res sit difficillima, administrare, regere ac gubernare dioecesim quae ex diversis constet nationibus. Confitentur hoc ipsi Rmi Epi, haud raro, se propter ignorantiam linguarum, ex qua sequitur ignorantia naturae et morum singulorum, invictas experiri difficultates in administrandis paroeciis Polonorum, Lithuanorum, Bohemorum aliorumque Slovanorum. Neque enim Episcopus potest intelligere populum suum, neque suum Episcopum populus. Vicarii autem Generales, a secretis, aliique ama-

nuenses Episcoporum, solent etiam esse homines unius eiusdemque linguae. In archidioecesi Chicagiensi, v. g., sunt tres episcopi, duo vicarii generales, totidemque a secretis, sed omnes isti ecclesiastici callent unam tantum linguam anglicam, poloni sermonis ignari, licet sub eorum jurisdictione sint plusquam centum septuaginta millia Polonorum, non enumeratis Lithuanis, Bohemis et aliis Slovanis polone loquentibus. Inde vero, eo quia nec Episcopus populum suum, nec populus Episcopum intelligit, multas exoriri dissensiones mutuas clarum et perspicuum est. Testes sunt ipsi iidem Episcopi, qui vident ac deplorant easdem dissensiones in formale schisma persaepe mutari; sed cum propter ignorantiam linguae ad captum populi verba facere nequeant, hisce dissensionibus non valent occurrere.

In dioecesibus, quas Poloni magna ex parte constituunt, lingua polona ab Episcopis ignorari non potest sine magno detrimento animarum.

Ita fit ut Episcopus ignoret populi linguam, et, contra, linguam Episcopi ignoret populus, secundum illud S. Pauli: "Si quis ignorat, ignorabitur" (I. Co. 14, 38). Sed num populus vituperandus est propterea, quia ignorat linguam Episcopi, videlicet anglicam? Si quaerantur, utrum populus, quod attinet ad linguam, accommodare se debeat Episcopo, an Episcopus populo? utrum dioecesis sit pro Episcopo, an Episcopus pro dioecesi? Procul dubio respondendum est, Episcopum esse pro dioecesi et non contra; quapropter si dioecesis sit ex quinta, ex tertia, vel imo dimidia ex parte polona, etiam Episcopum debere scire hanc linguam polonam.

Neque in quacumque dioecesi, ubi Poloni degunt, Episcopos polone loquentes postulamus, sed tantummodo in iis dioecesibus, ubi Poloni magnam partem, scilicet quintam, quartam, tertiam vel dimidiam partem dioecesis constituunt.

Donum linguarum est necessarium in America.

Nonne Episcopi, etiam in America, successores sunt Apostolorum? Sed quid de Apostolis dictum est? Nonne legimus de iis in Actibus (II, 4): "Et coeperunt loqui variis linguis"? Miraculum hoc hodie non esse necessarium concedimus; sed donum linguarum in America hodie non esse necessarium ad salutem animarum negamus. Si donum linguarum est necessarium nobis nudis sacerdotibus, quibus in America praedicandum est tribus quatuorve linguis in una paroecia, quanto magis est necessarium iis, qui sunt et vocantur successores Apostolorum?

Hiberni, vulgo, hoc dono carent; sed novimus Germanos sacerdotes in America, praeter anglicam et germanicam linguam, loqui etiam, licet non semper, polona, gallica et italica. Poloni vero sa-

cerdotes in America solent loqui variis linguis, pluribus quam Germani. Plus quam dimidia pars Polonorum sacerdotum qui nati vel educati sunt in America, loquuntur ibi lingua anglica aeque bene ac ceteri indigeni Americani; sed, praeter anglicam et polonam, loquuntur etiam saepissime germanica, bohemica, gallica atque italica, memores illius S.ti Ignatii Loyolae: "Toties es homo, quot linguis loqueris"—et verborum Apostoli gentium: "Volo autem omnes vos loqui linguis" (I, Cor. 14,5).

Lingua vernacula haec, denique, est, quae valet ad captum populi.

Absit a nobis, ut affirmemus, tantummodo hoc donum linguarum efficere quemquam idoneum successorem Apostolorum; affirmamus tantum donum linguarum, *ceteris paribus*, in Episcopo dioecesim *polygloticam* administrante valde desiderari atque imo necessario requiri. Si enim Deus patravit vel miraculum, eo consilio, ut Apostoli loquerentur variis linguis, ex hoc ipso elucet, quanti momenti sit notitia variarum linguarum ad salutem animarum comparandam. Illis certe Apostolorum temporibus lingua latina aut graeca non minus erat diffusa, quam lingua anglica nostris hisce temporibus; attamen Deus non dubitavit patrare miraculum, ut unaquaeque natio, omnes homines et singuli audirent Evangelium praedicatum sua propria lingua. "Advenae Romani, Judaei quoque et Proselyti, Cretes et Arabes, audivimus eos loquentes *nostris linguis* magnalia Dei" (Act. 2, 11). Quare hoc? Etenim non lingua aliena (utut nota nobis), sed lingua familiaris et patria, lingua vernacula seu "nostra lingua" haec est, quae tandem valet ad captum populi, haec est quae aperit sensum et intellectum hominum, haec est clavis propria, qua aperitur thesaurus *absconditus veritatum.*

(*To be continued.*)

THE RELIGION OF AMERICAN MASONRY IS THE RELIGION OF THE PAGAN MYSTERIES.

In the preceding articles we proved from its own admissions, that AmericanMasonry is a religion. We proved that it is essentially anti-Christian, since it holds that it alone possesses the true knowledge of God and of the human soul, thereby excluding Christianity.

We shall now enter more in detail into the nature of its religion, and show from its sympathies, its affinities, its ceremonies, its initiation, its worship, its symbolism, that its object is to bring back mankind to the pagan worship of the pagan mysteries. It is not pagan idolatry in its grosser and more vulgar form, in which

worship was paid to wood, and stone, and senseless clay, but it is pagan worship in as much as it adores the procreative powers of nature, especially as resident in the human frame, the deification of which was, as is well known, the aim and scope of the pagan mysteries. For the restoration of paganism it lives and labors. We do not say that every Mason is aware of this, but if he is not, it is because he has not deeply studied the theories of his order. A sincere, candid and intelligent perusal of Mackey's Masonic Ritualist will reveal much to his eyes.

In the very first instructions concerning the "Opening and Closing of a Lodge" (on p. 12), our little guide introduces us to the ancient pagan mysteries.

"In the Ancient Mysteries," it says, "(those sacred rites which have furnished so many models for Masonic symbolism) the opening ceremonies were of the most solemn character. The sacred herald in the Ancient Mysteries commenced the ceremonies of opening the greater initiations by the solemn formula 'depart hence ye profane!' to which was added a proclamation which forbade the use of any language that might be deemed of unfavorable augury to the approaching rites."

These words certainly are the words of one who reverences paganism. "The sacred rites," "the most solemn character," "the sacred herald," "the solemn formula," all bespeak without reserve the feelings of the writer. And how could he speak otherwise of religious rites "which have furnished so many models for Masonic symbolism?" It would be strange to adopt sacred models and not revere them. We are not, however, to stop at affectionate reverence, we must, as soon as we enter the lodge, take part in pagan ceremonies. And hence our author (on pp. 25, 26, 27) sets forth elaborately the history and symbolism of the pagan rite of circumambulation. He proceeds orderly and first gives us the definition of the term.

"The rite of circumambulation," he says, "derived from the Latin verb 'circumambulare,' to walk around anything, is the name given to that observance in all the religious ceremonies of antiquity which consisted in a procession around an altar or some other sacred object."

Having thus defined circumambulation and cast around it the halo of antiquity, he proceeds:

"Thus in Greece, the priests and the people when engaged in their sacrificial rites always walked three times around the altar while singing a sacred hymn. Macrobius tells us that the ceremony had a reference to the motion of the heavenly bodies, which according to the ancient poets and philosophers produced an harmonious sound inaudible to human ears, which was called 'the

music of the spheres.' Hence in making this procession around the altar, great care was taken to move in imitation of the apparent movement of the sun. For this purpose they commenced at the east and proceeding by way of the south to the west, and thence by the north, they arrived at the east again. By this method it will be perceived that the right side was always nearest the altar."

In such wise are we, dear reader, transported to pagan Greece and its sacrificial rites, and instructed both in the manner of circumambulation and its reasons. We are to take part in a pagan religious ceremony, which has the sun for its object, and we must exercise every care that we imitate its apparent motion. Our author, however, is only entering on his subject; let us allow him to proceed.

"Much stress," he tells us, "was laid by the ancients on the necessity of keeping the altar on the right hand of the persons moving around, because it was in this way only that the apparent motion of the sun from east to west could be imitated. Thus Plautus, the Roman poet, makes one of his characters say, 'If you would do reverence to the gods you must turn to the right hand'; and Gronovius in commentary on the passage says that the ancients 'in worshiping and praying to the gods were accustomed to turn to the right hand.' In one of the hymns of Callimachus, supposed to have been chanted by the priests of Apollo it is said: 'We imitate the example of the sun, and follow his benevolent course.' Virgil describes Corynaeus as purifying his companions at the funeral of Misenus by passing three times around them, and at the same time aspersing them with lustral water, which action he could not have conveniently performed, unless he had moved with his right hand towards them, thus making his circuit from east to west by the south. In fact the ceremony of circumambulation was, among the Romans, so intimately connected with every religious rite of expiation or purification that the same word lustrare came at length to signify both to purify, which was its original meaning, and also to walk around anything."

To read our author, one would imagine that Plautus was par excellence the poet of the Romans: "Plautus, the Roman poet." As a man of some erudition Mr. Mackey certainly was not unaware of Horace's opinion so clearly expressed in the Ars Poetica: "At vestri proavi plautinos et numeros et Laudavere sales, nimium patienter utrumque, Ne dicam stulte, mirati; si modo ego et vos Scimus inurbanum lepido seponere dicto, Legitimumque sonum digitis callemus et aure." (Ars Poetica, l. 270.)

"But your ancestors," says Horace, speaking to his fellow

Romans, "praised the rhythm and witticisms of Plautus, admiring both too patiently, not to say stupidly; if indeed you and I know how to distinguish a coarse from a witty saying, and with ear and finger can note legitimate verse." But even if Plautus had been the prince of Roman poets, the fact that one of his characters makes the assertion attributed to him, is no indication, of itself, of anything more than a mere personal opinion of the speaker. When Shakespeare makes Falstaff say of his own voice: "For my voice–I have lost it with hollaing and singing of anthems," it doesn't for a moment follow either that the fact was true, or even if it was, that such was the common method of losing voices in Shakespeare's time. A playwright puts into the mouths of his characters, sentiments suited to them, but is not sponsor for the truth or falsity of such sentiments. We know from Cicero, Div. 2, 39, that in auspices and divinations the Romans considered the left hand as lucky, whereas the Greeks and barbarians considered the right. I subjoin his text:

"Ad nostri augurii consuetudinem dixit Ennius,

'Quum tonuit laevum bene tempestate serena.'

At Homericus Ajax apud Achillem querens de ferocitate Trojanorum, nescio quid, hoc modo nunciat:

'Prospera Jupiter his dextris fulgoribus edit.'

Ita nobis sinistra videntur, Graiis et barbaris dextra, meliora. Quamquam haud ignoro, quae bona sint, sinistra nos dicere, etiam si dextra sint."

"Ennius," says he, "speaking of our manner of augury, asserts that it is a good sign when in a clear sky it thunders to the left. Whereas Ajax in Homer, complaining to Achilles about the fierceness of the Trojans, announces I know not what, in this manner: 'Jupiter by these lightnings to the right has given a favorable sign.' Thus to us omens to the left are better, while to the Greeks and barbarians they are those to the right. Although I am not ignorant that if they are good, we speak of them as on the left, even though they are on the right." So speaks Cicero.

My readers are doubtless aware, however, that in imitation of the Greeks some of the Romans considered the right hand as auspicious; but this was not, as our author supposes, universal among them, nor of the earlier antiquity represented by Ennius. The term, moreover, 'circumambulation' (*circumambulatio*) is not a Latin word at all; nor is the verb *circumambulare*, from which it is derived, found in any classical Latin author. The Latin verb *lustrare* and its equivalent Greek καθαίρω signify primarily to cleanse, to purify; the walking around was sometimes united to the purification, sometimes not. It was certainly not essential in every ceremony of this nature.

But let us not delay on these matters, for even granting that the pagan Greeks and Romans did practise the rite of circumambulation in all their rites of purification, what follows from the fact?

That therefore I should do the same? They did it, therefore I should, can stand as an argument then only when my religious belief and practice is similar to theirs. I am arguing from like to like: else there is no argument. If, therefore, Masonry so defends its use of this rite because and as these pagan nations practised it, the relation of Masonry to such religions can not be concealed.

* * *

Objections to Free Public Libraries.—The *Catholic Universe* puts the case against Mr. Carnegie very well when it speaks as follows:

"Any one who frequently visits the public libraries of our large cities must be struck with dismay when he sees the never-decreasing throngs that besiege the fiction department, in marked contrast to the few who seek more solid entertainment in the departments of history, science, literature, or philosophy. If he be a thoughtful visitor he will note something else besides the number of novel-readers. He will notice that the trashiest and frothiest of novels are most in demand, and that in the faces of those who occupy the chairs in the reading room, spending hours in reading those novels or the lighter magazines, there is a peculiar sameness of expresssion,—a kind of aimless preoccupation, the vacant aloofness of people who have lost sight of the real demands of life in the cheap illusions of an unhealthy imagination."

That not too Catholic periodical, *Blackwood's Magazine*, says on the same subject:

"Not even the champions of free libraries are wholly satisfied with their achievement. They are obliged to confess that the number of real students is small indeed; they complain bitterly that the vast majority of readers demand no more than the trumpery novel, which as an anodyne, is a formidable rival to the gin-palace.....A library should be something better than a hastily purchased agglomeration of books, and it is doubtful whether the gift of a building and the sudden imposition of an unwelcome rate are the wisest possible encouragement of learning. The truth is, that reading is not of itself a good or useful action. It is with many merely another form of laziness.....And the worst of free libraries is that they place before all and sundry a mass of printed matter which the victims are unable to distinguish or appreciate. Facility can only be bought at a price, and the price we have paid and are paying for the general diffusion of knowledge is false learning and much bad literature." (Quoted in the *Casket*, No. 3.)

"Ragtime" in the Philippines.—The American ragtime music catches the native's ear in remarkable fashion, says a Manila correspondent of the Boston *Transcript*. He evidently thinks, "There'll be a Hot Time in the Old Town To-night" is our national hymn, for the native bands play it on all occasions, even at funerals. Some juxtapositions which their tunes produce are full of amusement, of which the natives are blissfully unconscious. During Holy Week processions are almost constantly moving, each usually headed by a life-size wooden figure of a saint. One of these, in a provincial town near Manila, had a figure of the Virgin, elaborately clad in silks and satins. The band just behind played away vigorously at "There's Just One Girl in This World for Me."